1	UNITED STATE:	S BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	DISTRICT	OF PUERTO RICO
3	In Re:) Docket No. 11-06637-MCF7
4	JUAN CARLOS BALCELLS) Chapter 7)
5	GALLARETA,) Old San Juan, Puerto Rico) February 9, 2022
6	Debtor.)) Adv. Proc. 14-00137-MCF
7		x)
8	NOREEN WISCOVITCH RENTAS, ET AL.,	
9	Plaintiffs,)
10	V.)
11	AMARILIS GONZALEZ GARCIA,))
12	Defendant.) x)
13)
14 15	TRUSTEE'S MOTION IN COMPLIA	O THE PLAINTIFF (DKT #220) NCE WITH THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE KT #223)
16	BEFORE THE HONORA	ABLE MILDRED CABAN FLORES
17	UNITED STATES	BANKRUPTCY JUDGE.
18		
19	APPEARANCES (TELEPHONICALLY):	:
20	For the Chapter 7 Trustee:	RAFAEL A. GONZALEZ VALIENTE, ESO.
21		NOREEN WISCOVITCH-RENTAS, ESQ.
22	Pro Se Defendant:	AMARILIS GONZALEZ GARCIA
23		
24	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING.	
25	TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY TRANSC	CRIPTION SERVICE.



1	Old San Juan, Puerto Rico	
2	February 9, 2022	
3	At or about 9:30 a.m.	
4	* * *	
5	THE CLERK: Calling case number 2 and case number 3	
6	are case number 2011-6637, Juan Carlos Balcells Gallareta, and	
7	adversary proceeding 2014-137	
8	THE COURT: If debtor's counsel can make the	
9	appearance, followed by creditor's counsel and any other	
10	party-in-interest.	
11	MR. GONZALEZ: Good morning, Your Honor.	
12	THE COURT: And	
13	MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, sorry.	
14	THE COURT: No, you may proceed.	
15	MR. GONZALEZ: Oh. Attorney Rafael Gonzalez	
16	Valiente, representation of the bankruptcy estate, Your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Gonzalez Valiente.	
18	Any debtor, creditor's counsel present	
19	MS. GONZALEZ: I'm	
20	THE COURT: for the case of	
21	MS. GONZALEZ: Amarilis Gonzalez, pro se, as a	
22	creditor.	
23	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Gonzalez.	
24	MS. GONZALEZ: Good morning.	
25	THE COURT: Anyone else in the Juan Carlos Balcells	



Gallareta?

MS. WISCOVITCH: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. Noreen Wiscovitch, Chapter 7 trustee.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Wiscovitch.

Anyone else?

So I understand we have everyone. Okay. So we have two matters. I understand we have the Chapter 7 trustee's amended objection to claim 5-2 filed by the claimant Amarilis Gonzalez Garcia. We have also a motion for summary judgment in opposition. And we have -- the other matter is the order to show cause and the trustee's motion and compliance with the order to show cause with respect to the sale of the residential property that is co-owned by the debtor and the codebtor.

Okay. So I will hear from the trustee.

MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, as a preliminary matter, we have a problem with Ms. Amarilis Gonzalez appearing on behalf of her children because she's not an attorney admitted to the court. And by her own representations, the proof of claim is for child support owed, or allegedly owed, to the children. She has been granted multiple changes to get representation. The last time was at docket 204, which was entered in December 10 of 2020, over a year ago.

She simply cannot represent her children, who are adults, and that is part of the objection. And she claims --

THE COURT: I have --1 2 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. She --3 THE COURT: Okay. I have a question. 4 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 5 THE COURT: With respect to the claim --6 MR. GONZALEZ: Um-hum. 7 THE COURT: -- amounts that are filed on the 8 docket --9 MR. GONZALEZ: Um-hum. 10 THE COURT: -- are those claims owed while the 11 children were minors? 12 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. So at the time of the filing of 14 the case, those were the debts owed to minors. 15 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, but --16 THE COURT: And then they became legal age? 17 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. And the case law is very, very 18 clear in Puerto Rico, and I can cite -- I'm sorry, give me --19 yes. Give me just one second. I apologize. I just opened 20 the case and closed it. Israel Figueroa v. Petra Rivera from 21 the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, 149 DPR 565, which states 22 that as soon as the children reach the majority of age, the 23 spouse or parent loses the padre protestante and may not 24 represent the children anymore. They lose the capacity to 25 represent the children who are no longer minors.



And that is the case before us, Your Honor. She simply cannot represent -- she's not an attorney. She's definitely not admitted to the bar. And she has no capacity to represent the children. They either have to come by themselves, or they have to hire an attorney. Ms. Gonzalez has requested, on multiple occasions, permission to hire an attorney because she keeps changing attorneys, and the last time was in 2020, and she failed to hire an attorney then. She simply cannot represent the young adults that are no longer minors.

THE COURT: I will hear from Ms. Amarilis Gonzalez.

MS. GONZALEZ: I believe -- I am not -- I don't agree with what Gonzalez Valiente, attorney, said. The major thing in here is that most of the time, the attorney trustee is twisting the law and changing the main purpose of the law because the claim, the child super debt claim was presented to the court on February of 2012. That is almost ten years ago.

And with that presentation of the claim, I also claimed that there was a post-martial community property that must be divided. And through the proceedings, the trustee -- I sent to the trustee several reports from -- forensic reports reporting concealants (sic) and traits of fraud and transference of properties and everything she needed to object properties that were concealed. So I presented that information for the court and for the trustee to do her duty

as a trustee, and none of that was done.

I also provided the court with he case law and the laws of Puerto Rico regarding post-marital community property, and I explain everything. And regarding my capacity as represent my children, I had the capacity when they were minors, and that is the only thing I need because the bankruptcy law only requires that the presentation must be made by the person that can made that in the moment of the origination or the filling of the claim. So again, the attorneys of the trustee is mixing the law, mixing the local law and the bankruptcy law.

And with all this, I usually -- I am an attorney for the -- admitted to the local bar, and I am also admitted to the federal bar, which I don't usually practice. That's why I don't know exactly all the rules and all the different rules that you have. So if I don't meet once or any -- it's not on purpose like the attorney of trustee said in his last motion. I am not doing that on purpose, I've been taking too much time in this matter. I think that, as the other trustee in the other case said, this matter should be conducted quick.

I think that trustee is even -- by the concealance (sic) of the property she made, she's even violating 18 USC Section 153 and 154. I submitted all the information necessary. I even submitted two reports and I also submitted a letter to the U.S. Trustee containing all the evidence that

she is telling in this motion that she never received.

I also made, through the attorneys, that I contracted once or twice or times I contracted. And they made some discoveries, and she denied and she almost answered them empty, with no information. I don't know why she's trying to conceal that the properties -- really, I think that that's not her duty. And all that she's requesting in her motions, she's twisting the law, and the ethics in Puerto Rico -- the law of ethics is against that. And I think she's practicing under Puerto Rico law. Also, I really don't know the federal law, but the Puerto Rico law is very strict with that.

THE COURT: Okay. I think I'm ready to rule on the issue with respect to the standing. So this case was filed back in 2011. The proof of claim is over a decade old, and at the time that the claim was filed, the children were minors, and therefore, she had the standing to file the claim and she has the standing to prosecute that claim. She, as an unpaid parent, has the right to recover from the other parent that has not paid the domestic support obligation in so many years. So she does have the right to be heard with respect to the claim that she filed over ten years ago. Claims are determined at the time of the petition.

So I would like to move to the issue about the sale of the property that is co-owned by the debtor and Ms. Gonzalez, trustee.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, Your Honor. And I apologize. There is a truck parked right in front of our office. We're asking them to move because of the noise. So if you can't hear me, just let me know, and I'll try to speak louder. THE COURT: I heard you, so. MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, as we explained in our motion in compliance with order, the requirements for a complaint or an action under 363(b) is that there be some benefit to the estate. As shown in our motion in compliance with order, there will be a benefit to the estate, and that was using the value of the properties -- of the property prior to the current boom in property values, Your Honor, which probably means that the property will probably be worth even more than it is -- than it does now. I don't know if that answers your question, or if you have a specific question as to any part of the response, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yes. My question is what is the benefit to the estate? What is the benefit to the estate if the

trustee is able to sell it at the recent appraisal?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

There's only one different -- there's THE COURT: only, I understand, 1,000-dollar difference between the --

MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- the real estate appraisal submitted.



MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. As of the time of the filing of the motion in response to order, the only lien on the property was 38,000 dollars. When we subtract that from 246, that leaves approximately -- that leave approximately 208,000 dollars in equity, Your Honor. Divided by 2, that's over 103,000 dollars. We believe that the claim filed by Ms. Amarilis Gonzalez in representation of her children is, at most, 97,000 dollars, so there is a positive benefit for the estate, and that is at that value. If we can sell the property for more, then there will be -- there would be additional benefit for the estate.

But Your Honor, this is a matter for when the property is requested to be sold, and let me explain. If the complaint is granted, that doesn't mean that the property will automatically be sold. The trustee has to go and find a purchaser for the property. If, when the property's sold, the best offer that's obtained for -- and I'm making up an example -- is 150,000 dollars, then obviously, there won't be enough benefit in order to pay administrative expenses, and the Court may decide -- after review, may decide to deny the right to sell.

The complaint is only for the right to go and look for a purchaser, but we still would have to go through the process of the approval of the sale, which is when the benefit to the estate would be determined, Your Honor. If we can sell

the property for 300,000 dollars, then definitely, there would be enough money to pay creditors and there would be a benefit to the estate. But we can't reach that stage until we're allowed to do so, Your Honor. Any calculations we do now are purely hypothetical, Your Honor, because we can't obtain offers until we're allowed to look for them. And that is what would be resolved if we finally get the complaint for 363 sale to be approved. Again, we don't automatically get permission to sell; we just get permission to attempt to sell, to market the property.

Ms. Amarilis --

THE COURT: I'll hear from Ms. Gonzalez.

MS. GONZALEZ: Okay. I presented the cases for the post-marital community property because if the distribution of the assets must be done before the trustee knows the bankruptcy estate, she needs to know the composition of the bankruptcy estate because it's important because debtor already have more than almost the majority of the assets that's to be computer in that estate, in the post-marital community property.

So the attorney needs to bring those assets and then divide them and sell what he already has because he has the majority. He has the assets that compose the corporation that -- if he brings the shares of the corporation and sell the asset that he already took that I don't -- assets that

belong to both of us, then he should be able to sell what the debtor already took. The debtor took the majority of the assets that should be considered, and this is the only property remaining that he also -- the debtor and the trustee also want.

But they took what he already have and consider selling to pay the corporation debts because the biggest and substantial debt claimed in this Chapter 7 bankruptcy is a debt from (indiscernible) corporation. And he's trying to sell the residential property, the one property left, to pay mostly corporation debts.

And the thing is that he needs to bring all that to consider obtaining the portion that could respond to the debtor for them determining what is compose the bankruptcy estate. And then I suggest that -- I recommend that they can sell those properties. And in fact, those properties, after the corresponding distribution, can be sell to pay the corporation debts. That's the reasonable thing to do.

And regarding the residential property, since the beginning, I requested that the portion could be adjudicated because of the child support seizures of properties. I presented the disposition. I don't have it here, ready, but -- and I also -- the property can also be -- I can request the property as a reimbursement for the debt in the post-marital distribution. And as I said, the best solution is to

bring the properties and the assets and the corporation shares to pay the corporation debts after the corresponding distribution and after the corresponding determination of the charges made to defraud and the charges made by the actual spouse and all that.

And also, Puerto Rico law includes the actual spouse to be responsible for his debts. So she must be included in the proceedings to pay his debts. And she was also married at the time he claimed for the bankruptcy, so that could be another option.

MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, Attorney Gonzalez

Valiente, representation of the estate. With all due respect
to Ms. Gonzalez, nothing of what she just said has anything to
do with whether this property can be sold under Section

363(c). There is a benefit to the estate, but like we said,
we estimate there will be a benefit to the estate, but until
we can market the property, we won't know for sure. When a
motion for sale of the property is filed, Ms. Amarilis has all
the right to come and say that there's no benefit or whatever
other objection she may have to the sale at that time.

And to answer, because I feel compelled after all the comments by Ms. Gonzalez, she did send a report on what she believes to be fraudulent actions by the debtor. We investigated. The trustee investigated it. The U.S. Trustee investigated it. And there is nothing -- they found nothing

to support those allegations.

If Ms. Amarilis believes that the debtor committed fraudulent actions, she could have filed a complaint to object the discharge, Your Honor. She did not. And that is the reason why a competent attorney has to represent parties in these proceedings. She simply does not understand the process. And it's fine; she's not a practicing attorney. There's nothing wrong with that. But she does need to hire counsel, or she's simply making all of us and the Court waste our time because she did not address the Court's questions now or before, in her other arguments.

Whether she can or cannot file a reimbursement action, Your Honor, she can't. The time for filing a proof of claims has passed years ago. She may not file another claim.

If she believes that the debtor committed fraud, there are vehicles that can be used to addressed that, and the debtor can defend himself. The estate is the estate, and the house is an asset of the estate, which the trustee has a duty to dispose of in order to pay creditors. This is not that she wants; it is her duty imposed upon her as a trustee.

THE COURT: Let me ask a question. Back to the sale, the notary fee would be one percent, correct, of any sale that the trustee conducts on the residential property?

MR. GONZALEZ: Between --

THE COURT: Under state law.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GONZALEZ: Between half a percent and one percent. THE COURT: But the law requires one percent. You would have to get a notary to agree to less, correct? MR. GONZALEZ: No. The law says that the notary may charge between half a percent and one percent. That's what the notary law says. Or zero percent; he can waive his fees if he wants. But the purchaser could also pay the notary fees if he so wishes. So again, until we have a transaction that is offered by the trustee with a proposed purchaser, we can't know if there will be a benefit to the estate and how much. Again, if the property can be sold for 350,000 dollars -- and I'm inventing the number -- there's definite benefit to the estate, but we won't know until we can market the property, Your Honor. THE COURT: What I have is two appraisals, one for 245,000 and 246,000. The trustee believes they could sell it for higher than the appraisal amount? MR. GONZALEZ: Under current market circumstances, yes, Your Honor. But even with those appraisals, the --

THE COURT: But they just filed an appraisal for 246,000.

MR. GONZALEZ: Sorry. Yes, but that was from eight months ago, and the current market for properties is



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

exploding. Everything is being sold over appraised values, Your Honor. But more importantly -- and this is -- and this is -- and this is very important, Your Honor -- the property only has 38,000 dollars in liens. So if --THE COURT: How is that? I thought the claim was for 58,041 dollars, claim 2-2, so --MR. GONZALEZ: We --THE COURT: How is it 38,000? MR. GONZALEZ: We obtained a -- obviously payments were made post-petition on the mortgage, and we obtained, at one point --THE COURT: And the trustee's planning to take advantage of those payments that were paid to --MR. GONZALEZ: There are so many -- we only have to pay the lienholder what they are owed, Your Honor. And currently, they are owed approximately --THE COURT: And the trustee doesn't have to take into account the amounts that were paid to reduce that amount? MR. GONZALEZ: No, Your Honor. In order to provide a benefit to the estate, the only things that have to be subtracted are liens and other expenses associated with the That's it. The rest is a benefit to the estate, and the rest are claims against the estate that have to be paid

THE COURT: Okay.

from the benefit that is obtained from the sale.



MR. GONZALEZ: If Ms. Amarilis believes that she 1 2 has --3 MS. GONZALEZ: Okay. It -- the 4 MR. GONZALEZ: -- she has --5 THE COURT: Excuse me. Excuse me --6 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 7 THE COURT: -- Ms. Gonzalez, let the trustee finish, 8 and I'll come to you in a moment. 9 MS. GONZALEZ: Okay. Sorry. 10 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. Again, if Ms. Amarilis Gonzalez 11 believes that she has a post-petition claim for any payments 12 that she made, she may file a claim. Post-petition claims are 13 administrative claims and are not -- and are not time-barred 14 like pre-petition claims. But once again, they are claims 15 against the estate that have to be made, proven, and paid from 16 the benefit obtained from the sale. The only thing that has 17 to be paid from the sale -- the rest is benefit -- are the 18 cost of the sale and the liens, Your Honor. And again, we 19 don't have -- we cannot have the proves to really know what 20 the benefit to the estate will be until we reach the stage of 21 asking permission of the Court for sale of the property. 22 Your Honor, there is no -- there is no --23 THE COURT: Mr. Gonzalez. Mr. --24 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 25



THE COURT: -- Gonzalez, a question, another question

I have. 1 2 MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Has the trustee hired a realtor in the 4 case. 5 MR. GONZALEZ: I don't recall, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: And how much --7 MS. WISCOVITCH: Your Honor, if I may? 8 THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Gonzalez. 9 MS. WISCOVITCH: No, it's Noreen Wiscovitch, the 10 Chapter 7 trustee. 11 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. 12 MS. WISCOVITCH: If I may? 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. WISCOVITCH: I just wanted to say that I have not 15 been able -- I believe that I realtor was hired at the 16 beginning. I will check the docket. But the realtor has not 17 been able to enter the property, just like none of the 18 appraisers have been able to enter the property because Ms. 19 Gonzalez has not allowed it. So I have not been able to 20 market the property. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. Just --22 MS. GONZALEZ: No. That's not true. 23 THE COURT: So what is the commission for -- the real 24 estate commission for the person who is going to sell? What 25 is their commission?



MR. GONZALEZ: It's usually --1 2 THE COURT: It's --3 MR. GONZALEZ: -- three percent, but I don't know what it was in this case. I'm going to check right now in the 4 5 docket. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. GONZALEZ: It's usually approximately three 8 percent. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Gonzalez? 10 MS. GONZALEZ: Yes. It's not true -- it's not true 11 that I didn't allow the appraiser. The appraiser did came 12 inside the house, and he made the appraisal from seeing the 13 house. So it's not true. 14 THE COURT: Your appraisal or the appraisal of the 15 trustee? MS. GONZALEZ: Appraiser of the trustee. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 18 MR. GONZALEZ: I don't believe that a realtor has 19 been hired in this case, Your Honor. I just checked the 20 docket, and no realtor has been hired in this case, Your 2.1 Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Can you give me, I would 23 say, a ten-minute recess. I just want to think about this. 24 So I am going to turn off my camera --25 MR. GONZALEZ: May I make one final comment, Your



Honor, before --

2.1

THE COURT: No.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay.

THE COURT: No. That --

MS. GONZALEZ: I am going to add something if I --

THE COURT: No, Ms. Gonzalez, either. Okay. I'm going to evaluate, and I've heard the parties. I have another case that needs to be called. I just want to look at the numbers. Thank you. Please stay on the call. I am going to turn off my camera and mute myself. I suggest you do so as well. And let's put it an exact time; we will come back to 10:15. So there will be a short recess.

(Whereupon a recess was taken)

THE COURT: The Court is ready to rule. The Court has heard the parties and has reviewed the various motions filed in the case. And this is the ruling of the Court.

And our ruling is that the trustee has not met her burden to show, one, the benefit to the estate. And even if she could meet this burden, then the trustee would have to show that this benefit outweighs the detriment to the exspouse.

And so based on our calculations, we are going to use the higher amount of the appraisal report, which is 246,000 dollars. That is based on the trustee's real estate appraisal. We are not going to speculate that it could be

even sold higher because this is what the trustee's real estate appraisal found, that it was valued at 246,000 dollars, and it is a recent appraisal.

From that amount, we are going to subtract the Banco Popular's secured claim of \$58,000.41. Although the trustee is trying to lower that amount to approximately 33-, 35,000 dollars, the trustee admitted that the DSO recipient could file a post-petition claim for the mortgage payments. So when you subtract 246,000 minus \$58,000.41, that gives us a subtotal of 187,959 dollars.

From there, we're going to subtract the closing costs. We're going to use 0.5 percent instead of the customary 1 percent. That would be 1,230 dollars minus -- so that would be 1,230 dollars minus 187,959 dollars. That would leave us 186,729 dollars.

Then we're going to subtract from that amount the three percent for the realtor. I understand the customary is four percent, but the trustee mentioned three percent for the commission for the realtor. That is 7,380 dollars minus the 186,729 dollars. That would leave us a subtotal of 179,349.

From that amount, we would subtract the homeowner's association claim, which is \$31,959.04 minus the 179,349.

That would leave us a subtotal of \$147,389.96

We would have to divide that in half. Half would go to the estate; half would go to the DSO. So dividing that

number by half, that would be \$73,694.98. The DSO claim is for 97,421 dollars. And we're assuming that we would grant the trustee's objection. There's not enough money to pay the DSO in full, and since there's not enough money to pay the DSO in full, there's no extra money for any other unsecured creditor of the estate.

So the detriment to the ex-spouse clearly outweighs any benefit to the estate. The sale would only satisfy the secured creditor, the trustee's fees, the HOA fees, and partially pay -- partially pay -- the ex-spouse. And that would mean that the ex-spouse would become homeless because she would lose her home and then not be paid one hundred percent of her DSO claim that she filed in the case. And no other unsecured creditors would be paid from the sale.

And even if the trustee were to find a buyer that would pay all the closing costs, there still would not be enough to satisfy, in full, the DSO claim and leave money left over for unsecured claims. The party that would most benefit from the sale is the secured creditor and the HOA claim.

So in the balance, the sale causes more detriment to the ex-spouse than it benefits the bankruptcy estate. Even if the sale took place, all other unsecured claims would not be satisfied.

So for those reasons, the Court dismisses the adversary action filed by the trustee against the co-owner



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

because the trustee has failed to show cause that it complies with the third prong of the test under Section 363(h) of the bankruptcy case. So the case is dismissed. That is the ruling of the Court. I thank the parties for their time and their arguments. We are going to call the next case. MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah --THE COURT: Mr. Gonzalez? MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, Your Honor. We would also like to have the Court resolve the objection to claim, Your Honor. THE COURT: The objection to claim is moot. MR. GONZALEZ: No, Your Honor. It's not. We filed an objection to claim. It has to be decided. THE COURT: So we will hear that on March 9th, 2022, at 9 a.m. I have to call the next case. MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you, Your Honor. Have a good day. Permission to withdraw. THE COURT: You are granted permission to withdraw. Anyone else that wishes to withdraw, you may do so. You can disconnect from the call. We are going to call the next case unless --MS. GONZALEZ: Thank you. Okay. THE COURT: Good day to all. (At 10:30 am, proceedings concluded.)



1	U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT)
2	DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO)
3	
4	I certify that this transcript consisting of 22 pages
5	is a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability
6	of the audio proceeding in this case before the Honorable
7	Mildred Caban Flores on February 9, 2022, as recorded by the
8	Courtroom Deputy.
9	Audio proceedings were recorded and were provided to
10	this reporter by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and this certified
11	reporter accepts no responsibility for any events that
12	occurred during the above proceedings, for any inaudible
13	and/or indiscernible responses by any person or party involved
14	in the proceeding or for the content of the audio recording
15	provided.
16	
17	Shoshara Chara aftell
18	
19	Shoshana Chana Axtell, CDLT-106 Official Court Transcriber
20	May 4, 2022
21	eScribers, LLC
22	7227 N. 16th Street
23	Suite #207
24	Phoenix, AZ 85020
25	

